REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed April 4, 2006 (the "Office Action"). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Section 103 Rejections

The Office Action rejects Claims 1, 3-4, 6, 9, 11-12, 14, 17, 19-20 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,483,522 to Derby et al. ("*Derby*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,947,415 to Nagaraj ("*Nagaraj*"). The Office Action rejects Claims 5, 7-8, 13, 15-16, 21 and 23-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Derby* in view of *Nagaraj* as applied to Claims 1, 9 or 17 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6, 016,306 to Le Boudec et al ("*Le Boudec*"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claim 1 recites RTPs each comprising intra RTP connections between internal RTP components, the intra RTP connections having a higher speed than the asymmetric connections between the RTPs. The Office Action contends that *Derby* discloses this claim element at col. 5, lines 34-38 and 40-41 and states "note: each adapter examines all packets on the bus – therefore, the speed of all the packets from all adapters is higher than the speed of the asymmetric connections between the RTPs representing only two of the adapters of the subnode – fig. 2, items 15-16." Office Action, page 2. The column 5 portions of *Derby* cited in the Office Action in support of this contention merely state that:

> Such packets arrive from external nodes over links via transmission adapters 24, 25, . . . , 26, or originate in internal node user applications via application adapters 20, 21, . . . , 22, or arrive from other subnodes within the node via intranode adapters 14, 15 . . . 16. Packets might also be placed on the bus by network control function adapters. All adapters in a subnode examine packet headers of packets on bus 23.

Derby, col. 5, lines 34-41.

However, neither these portions nor any other portions of *Derby* disclose, teach or suggest intra RTP connections between internal RTP components having higher speed than asymmetric connections between the RTPs. As an initial matter, the cited portion does not in any way mention <u>speed</u> of connections. The Office Action seems to suggest disclosure of speed in the examination of packets by adapters 24-26. However, *Derby* <u>never discloses</u>, as the Office Action suggests, that "<u>each</u> adapter examines <u>all</u> packets on the bus." Office Action, page 2 (emphasis added). *Derby* merely states that "[a]ll adapters in a subnode examine packet headers of packets on bus 23" (there is <u>no disclosure</u> that <u>each</u> adapter examines <u>all</u> packets). Moreover, even if *Derby* did make such a disclosure, there is no disclosure of speed of the connections. Moreover, the Office Action suggests that the connections from adapters 24-26 is higher than the speed of connections between adapters 15 and 16. However, the claim element states that <u>intra RTP</u> connections <u>between internal RTP components</u> have a higher speed than <u>asymmetric</u> connections <u>between the RTPs</u>. The Office Action fails to indicate how the adapters 24-26 involve <u>intra RTP</u> connections <u>between internal RTP components</u>, while the connection between adapters 15 and 16 involve connections <u>between RTPs</u>. In addition, the Office Action fails to indicate how the adapters 15 and 16 connections are <u>asymmetric</u>, particularly in light of the Office Action's contention that asymmetric connections are illustrated in *Derby* "by a various number of connections for different subnodes of a node; for example subnodes 5 and 7 of node 60 each have only one connection to another subnode, while subnode 6 has two connections to other subnodes." Office Action, page 2.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that *Derby* does not disclose, teach or suggest each element of Claim 1 and requests that the rejection of Claim 1 be withdrawn. In addition, for analogous reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that *Derby* does not disclose, teach or suggest each element of independent Claims 9 and 17 and respectfully requests that the rejections of these claims be withdrawn.

Applicant also notes that on numerous previous occasions, the Examiner has indicated that *Derby* does not disclose either asymmetric connections between RTPs in a network node

or RTPs each comprising intra RTP connections between internal RTP components, the intra RTP connections having a higher speed than the asymmetric connections between the RTPs. *See, e.g.,* Office Action mailed 8/24/05, page 3.

Claims 3-8 each depends from Claim 1, Claims 11-16 each depends from Claim 9 and Claims 19-24 each depends from Claim 17. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to Claims 1, 9 and 17, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 3-8, 11-16 and 19-24 are patentable over the cited art used in the rejections and request that the rejections of these claims be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all the pending claims.

If the present application is not allowed and/or if one or more of the rejections is maintained, Applicants hereby request a telephone conference with the Examiner and further request that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to schedule the telephone conference.

Applicants believe no fees are due. However, should there be a fee discrepancy, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants

Chad C. Walters
Reg. No. 48,022

Date: July 5, 2006

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

Customer Number: **05073**

DAL01:913175